

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 remain in the application.

Claim 5 was objected to on the basis that “planes” should be ~~plane~~. Claim 5 has been so amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 18, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by newly cited reference Chang (US 6,122,144). Claim 1 is distinguished over Chang by reciting:

“the pole tip portion of the first pole piece having non-overlapping first and second components wherein the first component forms a portion of the ABS and the second component is recessed from the ABS and is magnetically connected to the first component; and
the second component having a width that is less than a width of the first component wherein said widths are parallel to the ABS and parallel to a major plane of the write gap layer.”

This structure is shown in Figs. 15-18 wherein the second component 204 *of the first pole piece* does not overlap the first component (P1HF) *of the first pole piece* and has a width which is less than the width of the first component. In support of his rejection the Examiner states:

“the pole tip portion 306 of the first pole piece having non-overlapping first and second components wherein the first component forms a portion of the ABS (the tapered structure defined by reference numerals 306/308/310) and a second component recessed from the ABS (the narrowed, reduced cross section portion defined by reference numerals 328/330 in figure 26) wherein the second component (reduced cross section portion) has a width which is less than the width of the first component and is entirely within a region which is recessed from the ABS.”

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the first pole piece of Chang has first and second components wherein the first component has a tapered structure defined by the reference numerals 306/308/310 and a second component defined by reference numerals 328/330. In contrast the first pole piece layer 232 in Fig. 26 of Chang is a flat layer without the special configuration claimed by the Applicants. The Examiner’s attention is respectfully invited to Chang’s specification wherein the first pole piece layer 218 is described as including the flat layer 232 (see lines 1-4 of column 9) and the layer 220 (see lines 2-3 of column 8). Chang is in

conformance with the magnetic head art by describing the first constructed pole piece as being the first pole piece and is typically shown in the bottom position as shown by Chang's drawings. In the magnetic head art the layer 216 in Fig. 26 of Chang would be referenced as a second pole piece layer which Chang does in lines 1-2 of Column 8. Since layer 216 of Chang is not a first pole piece layer the Applicants' respectfully maintain that claim 1 is clearly distinguished over Chang. Claims 2, 4 and 5, which are dependent on claim 1, are considered to be patentable over Chang for the same reasons as given for claim 1. Claims 7 and 11 recite similar limitations and are considered to be patentable over Chang for the same reasons as given for claim 1. Claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 7 and claims 12, 14 and 15, which are dependent upon claim 11 are considered to be patentable over Chang for the same reasons as given for their parent claims.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this document he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Ervin F. Johnston

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 20,190

Telephone: 808-661-1197

Fax: 808-661-9797